41. The need for promulgating rules under the Game and Fish Protection Regulation.

Mr. A. J. Wright (Member, Kannan Devan Planters' Association) said that he had once more to bring before the Assembly the subject of adequate provision for the preservation of game (animals, birds and fish), particularly in the High Range, that portion comprised in the estates under his Association. Rules for the regulation of hunting, shooting, fishing, etc., within the limits of reserved forests and of lands at the disposal of Government though not included in reserved forests, were enacted in 1913 under Regulation II of 1068 as amended by Regulations IV of 1071 and IX of 1085 and again amended in 1914, which seemed to afford the required protection in those areas. Large tracts of country did not come under the areas so dealt with. To extend the necessary protection to them also, Regulation XII of 1089 was enacted and amended by Regulation VI of 1091 and it became operative by Notification with effect from the 1st Vrischigam 1091. All material details, however, were left to be supplied in the form of rules to be framed under the various clauses of the Regulation. But up to the present time, no rules had been promulgated, though the attention of Government had been drawn to that fact annually at the Assembly. He understood that the draft rules had been under the consideration of the departments concerned, but regretted that the rules had not been published. The most important point was the difficulty of administering such rules once they had been enacted. To meet it, the Member suggested some years ago that a duly constituted Game Committee of his Association might be given the necessary powers to supervise the working and enforcement of the rules. In putting forward the suggestion, his Association did not seek any unconstitutional powers but simply placed themselves at the disposal of Government in the hope of forwarding the work in which they were keenly interested. The Planters were ready and willing to consider any suggestion as to the scope and method of the control Government might deem fit to make to safeguard their interests.

Dewan's reply.—The Additional Head Sirkar Vakil has been asked to draft a set of rules under sections 6 and 19 of the Game and Fish Protection Regulation, XII of 1089, to regulate the protection of game other than fish. The constitution of Game Committees is under reference to the Dewan Peishkars, and the Commissioner, Devicolam, who are being asked to propose a Committee for each Revenue Division.

42. Separation of Executive and Judicial functions.

Mr. C. Raman Tampi B. A., B. L. (Member, Quilon taluk) said that the subject had been before Government for some time. His representation of 1085 was sent for the opinions of the Dewan Peishkars and District Magistrates and the result was the appointment of a few Stationary Magistrates. The time had come to take a bolder step in the light of the experience gained. The present system of clubbing the two functions in one and the same officer was fraught with many evils. Neither the Magisterial nor the Land Revenue work was being efficiently or satisfactorily done. The collection of land revenue required the Tahsildars to frequently tour about which meant that the clients, witnesses, vakils, &c., had to accompany them in their camps. Similarly, the Dewan Peishkars too had a variety of duties which left them little time to attend to magisterial work. The work of administration of criminal justice consequently suffered in efficiency. The inspection of Criminal Courts was never done efficiently, as the District Magistrates had no time and the inspection by the High Court was carried out at distant intervals once in an year and as such was not effective. The public suffered most, as the Tahsildar-Magistrates were often prone to decline to receive complaints presented, especially in the quarter months. If the complete separation of the two functions was not feasible on account of want of funds, the Member suggested the following proposals as an alternative :—

(1) The number of Stationary Magistrates should be increased.

(2) Instead of having only one Division First Class Magistrate, each Division may be divided into two, three or four groups (according to area) of taluks and First

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly